REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed February 25, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I.   Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-6, 8, 24-29, and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Roztocil, et al.* ("Roztocil," U.S. Pat. No. 2001/0044868). Applicant respectfully traverses.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). In the present case, not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the Roztocil reference. Applicant discusses the Roztocil reference and Applicant's claims in the following.

A.   The Roztocil Disclosure

Roztocil discloses a production work flow 100 of a "typically production print shop." *Roztocil*, paragraph 0020. The work flow 100 comprises various stages, including job origination 102, job submission 104, job preparation 106, print production 108, and final fulfillment 110. *Roztocil*, Figure 1.

As shown in Figure 1, the print shop includes a computer network 112 that includes computer work stations 114, 116, servers 118, 120, and output devices 122. *Roztocil*, paragraph 0021. A customer can submit a job during job origination 102 by either physically delivering to the print shop one or more documents in hard copy or electronic form or by transmitting the one or more documents to the print shop via the Internet. *Roztocil*, paragraph 0022. After that point, all aspects of the production work flow 100 are performed at the print shop using its network 112. *See Roztocil*, paragraphs 0023-0033.

Included in the production work flow 100 performed at the print shop is what Roztocil calls "user functionality workflow 200." *Roztocil*, paragraph 0034. That workflow 200 includes a preflight stage 204 that is performed using a workflow management software program that executes on a job preparation workstation 116 at the print shop. *Roztocil*, paragraph 0036. Using that program, operators at the print shop can obtain data about the various output devices 122 of the print shop, including their availability and capabilities. *Roztocil*, paragraph 0045.

As can be appreciated from the above, with the exception of transmitting documents over the Internet to Roztocil's print shop, no actions of Roztocil's disclosed production work flow are performed at a customer's (e.g., designer's) location.

B.   Applicant's Claims

Applicant's independent claim 1 provides as follows:

1.   A method of managing workflow in a commercial printing environment including a designer location and a print service provider location, said method comprising:

creating at the designer location a digital file that represents an image to be printed;

receiving at the designer location from the print service provider location real time configuration information regarding a print production device at the print service provider location;

creating at the designer location relative to the received configuration information a high performance file by encapsulating a plurality of files associated with a print job created at the designer location, the plurality of files including the digital file that represents the image to be printed and a file that includes print job processing instructions;

submitting the high performance file from the designer location to the print service provider location via an electronic network; and

performing at the print service provider location at least one of automated printing, finishing, packaging, and shipping relative to the instructions contained in the high performance file.

Roztocil fails to teach limitations of claim 1.   First, Roztocil does not teach "receiving at the designer location from the print service provider location real time configuration information regarding a print production device at the print service provider location".   Although, Roztocil describes a customer transmitting a print job over the Internet to Roztocil's print shop (*Roztocil,* paragraph 0022), Roztocil does not indicate that any device configuration information is sent from the print service provider

location to the designer location. Instead, as described above, all actions in Roztocil's production work flow 100, with the exception of transmitting the job via the Internet, are performed at Roztocil's print shop. Furthermore, Roztocil says nothing about any location (including the designer location) receiving "real time" configuration information regarding a print production device.

Second, Roztocil does not teach "creating at the designer location relative to the received configuration information a high performance file by encapsulating a plurality of files associated with a print job created at the designer location". Although Roztocil describes the creation of a "ready for printer file" that includes a print job and a job ticket, Roztocil explicitly states that that file is created during "job preparation 106," which is performed at Roztocil's print shop by one of the print shop operators. *See Roztocil*, paragraphs 0027 and 0028. Therefore, no high performance file is created "at the designer location" as required by claim 1. Furthermore, because device no configuration information is sent from the print service provider location to the designer location, it follows that the designer location cannot have created a high performance file "relative to the configuration information".

In view of the foregoing, Roztocil does not anticipate Applicant's independent claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependents are allowable. Applicant further submits that independent claim 24 and its dependents are allowable for similar reasons.

II.   **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A.   **Rejection of Claims 7, 9, 30, and 32**

Claims 7, 9, 30, and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roztocil. Applicant respectfully traverses.

As identified above, Roztocil does not teach aspects of Applicant's claims. It logically follows that claims 7, 9, 30, and 32 are allowable over Roztocil for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 24 are allowable over Roztocil.

B.   **Rejection of Claims 10, 11, 33, and 34**

Claims 10, 11, 33, and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Roztocil*, as applied to claims 1 and 24, and further in view of *Kemp* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0078160). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As identified above, Roztocil does not teach aspects of Applicant's claims. In that Kemp does not remedy the deficiencies of the Roztocil reference, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10, 11, 33, and 34 are allowable over the Roztocil/Kemp combination for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 24 are allowable over Roztocil.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

David Rodack
Registration No. 47,034